



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/321,738	05/28/1999	LEE C. HAROLD	53470.000006	6984

29315 7590 08/25/2003

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2003

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/321,738

Applicant(s)

HAROLD ET AL.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application, filed 05/28/99; RCE and Amendment B filed 5/29/03.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 16, and 20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed provisional on 3/23/99).

In reference to claim 1, Yost teaches a system and method for management of an automatic OLAP report system. Specifically Yost teaches the following:

- An OLAP system for accessing information to perform report analysis. A system for receiving output from the OLAP system. See abstract and column 3.
Compare to ***“report receiving means for receiving a report processed by the OLAP system”***.
- Generating a spreadsheet module that presents the report in a spreadsheet program format. See columns 14-15. Compare to ***“report presenting means for generating a spreadsheet application for that report”***.

- A spreadsheet module for presenting reports and analyses to be presented in a spreadsheet program format over a network. The network enables the user system to access the server system. See columns 14-15. Compare to ***“report transmission means for transmitting the spreadsheet application within a page over the network to a user system to be displayed in the network user interface”***.

Yost teaches a system for managing an OLAP report system in which reports are transmitted in the form of a spreadsheet application, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit a spreadsheet application within a page over a network.

In reference to claim 2, Yost teaches that the system can be a relational OLAP system. See column 16, lines 62-64 and columns 1-2.

In reference to claim 3, Yost teaches a personalization module which enables users to specify content for a service. Users can personalize style parameters to tailor the format of the report. See columns 7-8.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 1-3 respectively above.

Claims 16 and 20 are rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above.

5. Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed provisional on 3/23/99) in view of Siow et al., US Patent 6,301,590, 10/9/2001 (filed 8/11/97).

In reference to claims 4 and 11, Yost does not disclose a format of a merged report; however, Siow discloses a system in which the user can specify multiple reports and format for the display of the multiple reports on a single page. See column 9, lines 32-61. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's system of merging reports into Yost's system since it allows a user to present information from multiple reports within a workbook in a single presentation.

6. Claims 5-7, 12-14, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed provisional on 3/23/99) in view of Comer et al., US Patent 5,819,293, 10/6/98.

In reference to claims 5, Yost's system does not disclose a means for receiving report requests comprised of macros and a presenting means with macros to modify the presentation of the report; however, Comer teaches using code in the form of a macro to execute various form instances. Comer teaches using macro facilities for providing various formatting options including printed pages and text, numeric values, captions, and legends in graphs. Comer's system teaches the use of a spreadsheet template to make changes to spreadsheet programs. See columns 1-2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yost's system of presenting a report and a spreadsheet application with Comer's spreadsheet template for altering formats using macros since Comer's invention is related to altering presentation means in a report.

In reference to claim 6, Yost teaches using an API module for defining reporting capabilities. Comer allows for the creation of macros for use in formatting the reports. Yost teaches using macros to allow a user to create a custom application project generator according to the API module. It would have been obvious to incorporate Comer into the system disclosed by Yost since it shows how to customize a report (such as that in a spreadsheet) with the use of macros and API modules.

In reference to claims 7, Comer discloses using macros to manipulate the format of the spreadsheet application. The rest of claim 7 is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 5 above.

Claims 12-14 and 17-19 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 5-7 respectively above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 6,317,750 B1	Tortolani et al.	11/13/01 (filed 10/26/98)
US Patent 5,572,644	Liaw et al.	11/5/96
US Patent 5,237,499	Garback	08/1993
US Patent 5,235,680	Bijnagte	08/1993

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh at 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at 703.305.9792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

After-Final	703.746.7238
Official	703.746.7239
Non-Official/Draft	703.746.7240

Hand-Delivered responses should be brought to Crystal park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Rachna Singh
July 30, 2003


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER